



**Task Force on Trial Court Employees
Meeting Minutes
June 14-15, 1999
Hyatt Regency Irvine, Irvine, California**

<p><i>TASK FORCE MEMBERS:</i></p> <p><i>PRESENT:</i> Hon. James A. Ardaiz, Chair Hon. Aviva K. Bobb Mr. Gary Cramer Hon. Charles D. Field Ms. Karleen A. George Ms. Diane Givens Ms. Mary Louise Lee Mr. Ronald G. Overholt Ms. Christine E. Patton Mr. John Sansone Mr. Larry Spikes Mr. Robert Straight Mr. Mike Vargas</p> <p><i>ABSENT:</i> Ms. Pamela Aguilar Marshal Barbara J. Bare (Represented by Mr. Gary Cyr) Mr. Steve Perez Sheriff Charles Plummer Mr. Robert D. Walton</p>	<p><i>ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS STAFF:</i> Ms. Judith A. Myers, Director, Human Resources Bureau Ms. Deborah Brown, Attorney, Council and Legal Services Division Ms. Noema Olivas, Secretary, Human Resources Bureau Ms. Hazel Ann Reimche, Human Resources Analyst, Human Resources Bureau Ms. Sharon Smith, Staff Analyst, Human Resources Bureau (not present)</p> <p><i>OTHER STAFF:</i> Mr. Nathan Bitting, Administrative Coordinator, Career Group, Inc.</p> <p><i>FACILITATOR:</i> Ms. Liz Schiff, Organizational Development Specialist, Human Resources Bureau, Administrative Office of the Courts</p>
--	---

Monday, June 14, 1999

I. OPENING REMARKS

Justice James A. Ardaiz, chair, called the meeting in Irvine to order at 10:25 a.m. and welcomed everyone to the 14th meeting of the task force.

Ms. Liz Schiff reviewed the agenda and ground rules for the meeting.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comment speakers.

III. REVIEW OF JUNE 3 TASK FORCE MEETING AND ANNOUNCEMENT FOR TODAY'S MEETING

Justice Ardaiz reviewed the following actions taken by the task force at the June 3, 1999, meeting in Burbank, which included:

- Adopted the Working Group Insurance Benefits Definition, Assumptions, Objectives, and Model for Implementation of the Trial Court Employee Personnel System;
- Adopted the Working Accrued Leave Definition, Assumptions, Objectives, and Model for Implementation of the Trial Court Employee Personnel System;
- Adopted the Working Other Employer-Provided Benefits Definition, Assumptions, Objectives, and Model for Implementation of the Trial Court Employee Personnel System;
- Discussed and identified further issues to be addressed on the Working Transition Assumptions, Objectives, and Model for Implementation of the Trial Court Employee Personnel System;
- Reaffirmed simultaneous timing of Employee Advisory Vote and Public Entity Poll; and
- Discussed the possibility of extending the task force's timeline.

Justice Ardaiz identified the following objectives for the current meeting:

- Provide an opportunity for communication through a public comment period;
- Reach agreement regarding the task force's timeline;
- Review final group insurance, accrued leave, and other employer-provided benefits definitions, assumptions, objectives, and models.
- Identify issues related to retirement for new employees;
- Provide an update on the Survey on Trial Court Employees;
- Review comments on the task force's interim report and determine appropriate responses; and
- Reach agreement on transition assumptions, objectives, and model.

IV. RETIREMENT FOR NEW EMPLOYEES

Ms. Judith A. Myers introduced the issue of retirement for new employees and drew parallels between that issue and the work completed to date for retirement of current employees. Ms. Myers identified the key issues and concerns that need to be addressed concerning retirement for new employees.

The task force broke into small groups and discussed retirement benefits for new employees, including issues such as (1) what are the objectives of such a system; (2) what

are the advantages and disadvantages; and (3) what other issues are important to consider. Each group reported back to the full group and presented issues and ideas identified during their small group discussions.

V. REVIEW FINAL ACCRUED LEAVE, GROUP INSURANCE BENEFITS, AND OTHER EMPLOYER-PROVIDED BENEFITS: DEFINITIONS, ASSUMPTIONS, OBJECTIVES, AND MODELS

Ms. Myers explained to the task force that at their last meeting these models had been adopted with revisions still to be completed. She then presented the following completed definitions, assumptions, objectives and models:

- Accrued Leave
- Group Insurance Benefits; and
- Other Employer-Provided Benefits

Following discussion, these definitions, assumptions, objectives, and models were reaffirmed by the task force. These models will be posted to the task force's Web site.

Ms. Myers asked the task force about the appropriateness of applying these definitions, assumptions, objectives and models to both the new and old employees. The task force agreed that the models should apply to both new and old employees.

VI. TRIAL COURT EMPLOYEE SURVEY UPDATE

Ms. Hazel Ann Reimche presented an update of the progress to date of the consultant on the survey of trial court employees. Ms. Reimche reviewed a sample report showing the possible layout for presentation of data from the survey for verification by union representatives. The task force discussed the sample report and made recommendations for revisions.

VII. TRANSITION ISSUES

Ms. Deborah Brown reviewed the revised Working Transition Assumptions, Objectives, and Model for Implementation of the Trial Court Employee Personnel System. Ms. Brown highlighted the newest additions and modifications to the model and identified remaining areas requiring further research. The task force discussed and suggested modifications to the model. Staff will continue to develop the model and present additions to it at future meetings.

VIII. INTERIM REPORT COMMENTS

Ms. Myers reported that a total of 22 comments on the task force's interim report had been received from counties, courts, unions, and individuals. Copies of the comments were

given to the task force members for their review before discussion of the comments the following day.

IX. CLOSING REMARKS

Justice Ardaiz adjourned the meeting at 3:35 p.m.

Tuesday, June 15, 1999

I. OPENING REMARKS

Justice James A. Ardaiz called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

II. TIMELINE AND RELATED ISSUES

Justice Ardaiz reviewed the issues affecting the task force's timeline that had been presented at the meeting in Burbank. He highlighted both the issues that required further research and the need for rulings by independent agencies, which may not be sensitive to the task force's September 3, 1999 deadline.

Ms. Judith A. Myers reviewed the remaining tasks that need to be completed by the task force and introduced a proposed revised timeline with a completion date of December 1999.

Ms. Deborah Brown gave the task force a brief overview of the status, and possible timeframe, of research relating to deferred compensation and social security issues.

The task force discussed the timeline issues and the necessary tasks still to be completed. Judge Aviva K. Bobb moved to adopt the staff's proposed timeline. Mr. Ronald G. Overholt seconded the motion. The new timeline was adopted with Mr. Gary Cramer, Ms. Diane Givens, Ms. Karleen A. George, and Ms. Mary Louise Lee abstaining.

III. INTERIM REPORT COMMENTS

Justice Ardaiz reviewed the interim report comments that were distributed to the task force the preceding day.

The task force broke into small groups and reviewed the interim report comments, identifying issues, that might require clarification, or other possible action required by the task force. Each group reported back to the full group and presented issues they had

identified along with recommended actions. Staff will review these recommendations and consider further action to be taken.

IV. SECOND INTERIM REPORT

Justice Ardaiz introduced the question of whether the task force should present a second interim report considering the request for an extension to the timeline. Following discussion, Ms. Christine E. Patton made a motion for a second interim report. Judge Bobb seconded the motion. The task force was in agreement. Staff will review the timeline and determine if it is possible to accommodate a second interim report and maintain a December 1999 deadline.

V. CLOSING REMARKS

Justice Ardaiz adjourned the meeting at 12:15 p.m.